

Business Meeting Minutes - Spring 2006, Corvallis Inn

The meeting was called to order by Ed at 7:32.

Greg Young of Humboldt is serving as Parliamentarian.

1. President's Report: Trischa has done a wonderful job putting things together....

A new constitution has passed following the vote after NCA business meeting.
The Constitution goes into effect 6/1/06 - some issues will be dealt.

The Bylaws are in effect now unless otherwise posted on the website. The only bylaw that is not yet in effect is the change in junior/novice points, which becomes effective

Ed also starts getting committee information out - and has people sign up during the meeting. Kevin will be collecting the information.

Proposed budget - \$20,000 was in the account + the entry deposits.
We are currently in flux as of right now...

2. Kevin - Asked by Ed to summarize the changes that are being proposed for how business meetings will be conducted.

The concern: not all schools go to the national tournament or NCA, but want input.

The new process - reports starting in November will be posted on the NPDA website, so that this section of the meeting will go faster. Long reports won't have to be given.

3-tiered agenda –

- 1) Discussion items
- 2) Action items
- 3) Consent items

Some of this comes from Kevin's experience in his faculty senate as well as observations of other faculty-led organizations. Most items tend to be either quickly dealt with (the consent agenda), or need some time to discuss, and then it can be moved to action.

Discussion - Similar to previous meetings; time period for debate. Once discussion is done, item is held over to the next meeting – then it goes to the action agenda, during which it can be voted upon.

The belief is that between meetings, people will be able to get more information and provide feedback.

There is a provision for items that have to be dealt with urgently – a 2/3 vote at the meeting can move something from the discussion to the action agenda, so that it can be done as a majority vote.

Consent - Editorial changes from the constitution... minor editorial changes. Ask for unanimous consent. If there is ANY objection, it goes to regular discussion format. Items should move more quickly.

Robert's Rules of Order - will be in place starting with the next meetings.
There will be a regulation on how long some items can be discussed.

3. Caitlin Ross - People are happy with constitutional changes. More to report after student meeting tomorrow.
4. No reports from the Exec Secretary or the Webmaster.
5. Finance - Robert Trapp (2006-2007) – Steven Hunt and Robert put together, started with 2004-2005, and then adapted that budget to 2006-2007.

Most debate organizations are charging \$50; we should as well. NPDA has never increased fees until now.

Motion to change fees - passes. There will have to be supplemental increases for teams that have already paid their fees.

Then the motion to pass the budget. The budget is based on a TTU size tournament plus the increase in fees.

The budget passes as revised by the Committee.

6. Lisa Ashby - Sexual Harassment Policy - This has been sent to a labor relations/discrimination lawyer. Not a huge amount of change. Slight adaptations in the first couple of points.

Specific changes proposed – In the language of “report/address” - There has been informal in the past - this has been dropped. We recognize that this was disturbing to some people.

If being harassed - report to SHO (Sexual Harassment Officer). Complaints = national, plus any officers/employees at any time during their duties. Question - does this cover everyone else's tournaments? No. Individual campuses would cover issues of harassment for individual tournaments.

Hard to get people from across the country/get statements.

Now - SHO gets the complaint and investigates the complaint. If that is uncomfortable, the other option is (3) to the chair of Rules/Standards Tournament Sub-Committee.

Remedial action/retaliation stays the same.

There would be constitutional/bylaws changes to eliminate the CDSH.
There was an educational component - this goes to the Professional Development committee.

Robert asks on point 2 - does “reasonable person” lower the standard for harassment?

Ric Shafer asks - is there a definition of “promptly?” - Lisa says the lawyer suggested that we eliminate the notion of specific timeframes. Apparently, the TTU policy mentions a specific number of days.

The other question - does the accused have the right to know who the accuser is? Lisa mentions that normally this not the case, although the accused often can figure out who it is.

John Meany - Should be cautious about this – law varies from place to place. No uniform law applies. There may be affirmative duties for those in a managerial position... the policy cannot substitute for actions that may be called upon. i.e., in California, this policy does not waive liability.

(Ed Inch comments - this will ultimately go to the NCA meeting anyway).

7. Notes from the tournament host/director. Strikes pages now updated with 4 additional critics:

Question from Kate Shuster - How does someone get to be hired?

Konrad - Whoever we can find... in the past couple of weeks, there were fewer judges. Essentially, if you sign/submit the philosophy. Bachelor’s degree required.

Kate wants to lodge a complaint about some judges that are verbally hostile.

John Meany - Recounted an email sent to the listserv – what about those who are well past the deadline? Isn’t this unfair... Some get knowledge; others don’t.

Konrad’s response - \$500 drop fee for critics would be ideal... Bylaws should indicate when we do/don’t.

Trischa - Fluctuating numbers of teams - coming up with extra hired judges at the last minute.

John’s other issue - difference of opinion of rules. As going through judge philosophies ... not my job. The deadlines aren’t exclusionary. Deadlines are broken - come to this point.

Glenn Prince: People after deadline could be free strikes?

Konrad says - It’s reasonable.

Michael says - we already solve with the Tournament Administration Subcommittee.

Caitlin - Agree with Konrad. If institute now, we should.

Robert - All people here don't know... 3 problems with the system we have for dealing with the new judges now:

- 1) Who doesn't know?
- 2) Chase kids down.
- 3) Fix the computer?

Konrad says, we could delete

Brent - Then they're not in for rounds 1-2 - time to consider.

Mike Dorsi - will affect ability to pair? No.

Marty - Questions - hired judges - by tournament? Program? Both? Is this really fair to judges hired by the tournament? Are the numbers growing smaller at the tournament?

Konrad - No. Teams can enter at registration - unless we're out of space, we can't deny. Robert points out that new teams at registration can bump out existing teams.

Gary Rybold notes, "Why are we punishing these judges for coming after our initial deadline?"

Ed mentions, "I'm not aware of any judge philosophies"

John's response - 8-9 judges say, "I'll allow new points unless there is a POO."

Ed's response - Tell me who. We'll act as the bylaws specify. I have no complaints as of now.

Kate's question - what will the tournament do?

Ed - We'll talk with them if we know it's a problem. Ask the community to identify people who are a problem.

Kate's issue - it's the TD's problem. We shouldn't rat out fellow judges. Make the TD go through it.

Tournament parking:

Trischa - Go to Monroe, make right. 10 blocks. In front of you will be Kelly Engineering Building. Sorority girls took 9 minutes to walk the distance.

Skip's report from the Site Selection Committee – Colorado College for 2007. That is the bid. The committee moved to accept the bid.

March 22-25, 2007 (Thursday - Sunday).

Moved/seconded/passed to accept the Colorado College bid.

Trischa observed that for her school (and perhaps others on the quarter system), “Wednesday - Saturday = finals week.”

Ed - Monday not available at CC.

The bid does not have date.

Michael Dorsi's proposal - can be discussed now, but will go to NCA meeting. Can be in for 2007 if NCA approves...

Judge sharing - Could make it easier for the 1st judge. UC-Berkeley provided a judge for Carleton this year...

Marty asks - if a judge is bad, who would pay the penalty?

Mike suggests, write it to the agreement... or let the TD decide. What if it's a local judge, for example?

Brent mentions that we were trying to do that actively this year.

John: No language to prohibit now?

Mike - The first judge can't judge for two schools.

Trischa as journal editor - She's been preoccupied with the tournament... but there will be one journal coming out after the tournament. SHE WANTS ARTICLES! Send them to Trischa.

Treasurer's report: Brent says, “Give me \$20 this weekend.” Then there will be less paperwork.

Steve Hunt then brought a motion to adjourn, which was passed.